

**REMARKS**

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview. This Response is prepared in light of the discussion during the telephone interview. The amendment to the claims have been made in a manner consistent with the agreement reached during the telephone interview.

**Introduction**

Claims 30-63 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 are cancelled, without disclaimer or prejudice. By this Response, claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 have been amended. All amendments are supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims is hereby respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

**Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 30-32, 34, 36, 44-46, 48-53, and 56- 58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426) in view of Flanagan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,471), in further view of Kirsch (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,020).

Claims 33, 35 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al., and further in view of Kirsch, and further in view of Clark (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,243).

Claims 37-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al., and further in view of Kirsch, and further in view of Cartus (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,473). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 54 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan, and further in view of Kirsch, and further in view of Hargrave et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,724,593). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 59-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103.

By this Response, independent claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. The amended independent claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 make it clear that the content in a first language is accessed through a publicly accessible path on the Internet, like any user on the Internet who surfs the Internet. That is, the claimed system accesses content in the first language from a web site hosted by a web server, not as a part of the web server, but as a user or the like, i.e., some party that is not co-mingled with the web server. In addition, the amended independent claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 refer to “identifying a portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated” and clarify that subsequent “schedule” or “translating” operations are performed with respect to only the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated. That is, the translation is performed only for those portion(s) that is not yet translated.

As discussed during the telephone interview, the present invention intends to get away from a system which requires co-mingle of a multilingual management system and a web server that hosts content in a first language. See specification, paragraphs 8-9. However, this is precisely what Lakritz teaches. See Lakritz, Column 7, lines 24-27, Column 8, lines 4-11, 47-51, Column 11, lines 43-46, Column 12, lines 35-48 (manual activation/installation by a web site manager to orchestrate the creation of foreign language web pages, which shows that co-

mingling between Lakritz's multilingual management system and the web server is a necessity). In addition, the content managed by Lakritz's system for language translation is accessed via the web server that hosts the content. That is, the claimed invention is distinguishable from Lakritz because Lakritz does not teach access content in a first language hosted by a web server through a publicly accessible path on the Internet, as claimed in the amended independent claims. In addition, as the Examiner correctly consented during the telephone interview, Lakritz does not teach or disclose a multilingual management system which translates only the portion of content in a first language that is not yet translated, as recited in claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62. See Column 8, lines 4-11, Column 11, lines 43-47, lines 50-54.

It is well settled that in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the combination of the cited prior art references must disclose each and every claimed limitation. Since none of the cited second prior art references teaches or discloses the above discussed differences between Lakritz and the claimed invention, the prima facie case for obviousness has not been established. Thus, claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 are not obvious over Lakritz in view of the cited secondary prior art references. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 30, 45, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 31-44 depend from claim 30 and, thus, claims 31-44 are not obvious and patentable for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 30 and for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 31-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 46-49 depend from claim 45 and, thus, claims 46-49 are not obvious and patentable for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 45 and for the

additional featured recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 52-58 depend from claim 51 and, thus, claims 52-58 are not obvious and patentable for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 51 and for the additional featured recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 52-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Claim 63 depends from claim 62 and, thus, claim 63 is not obvious and patentable for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 62 and for the additional featured recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

The Applicants further respectfully submit that the new claim 64 is novel and non-obvious. Claim 64 recites “the step of translating is performed without participation of a web server that hosts the content in the first language”. This feature, as discussed above, is not taught in any of the prior art references. Therefore, the new claim 64 is not anticipate and non-obvious in view of the cited prior art references on the record.

### **Conclusion**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Stephen A. Becker

Registration No. 26,527

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:QH/lbg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: April 20, 2009**  
WDC99 1708581-1.074869.0013

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**